

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated February 14, 2005. Claims 1, 6 to 9, 11, 16 to 19, 23, 24, 27, 28, 31 and 32 are pending in the application, with Claims 5 and 15 having been cancelled and Claims 31 and 32 having been added. Claims 1, 9, 11, 19, 23 and 24 have been amended, and Claims 1, 9, 11, 19, 23, 24, 31 and 32 are in independent form. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, 1, 5 to 9, 11, 15 to 19, 23, 24, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,113,519 (Johnson). Claims 5 and 15 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter and without conceding the correctness of their rejection, and the substance thereof incorporated into Claims 1, 9, 11, 19, 23 and 24. Accordingly, this should be viewed as a traversal of the rejection.

The present invention generally concerns accessing an address book within a communication device, in which data of the address book is accessed in response to operations of a local user interface, and data of the address book is also accessed in response to requests from remote devices on a network. A decision is made whether to permit or deny address book data changing requests for the local and remote accesses. A first guide display is displayed on the local user interface, and the first guide display is operable by a local user to access data of the address book. According to one feature of the invention, address book changes are denied for the remote access while the first guide display is displayed on the local user interface, and address book changes are permitted for the remote access when the first guide display is not displayed on the local user interface.

By virtue of the foregoing, in which address book changes are denied for a remote access while a first guide display, which is operable by a local user to access data of the address book, is displayed on a local user interface, and address book changes are permitted for the remote access when the first guide display is not displayed on the local

user interface, priority of updating the address book is given to a user operating the local user interface and unpredicted changes of the address book are reduced.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claim 1 as amended is directed to a communication device having an address book storing data of communication destinations. The communication device comprises first access means for accessing data of the address book in response to operations of a local user interface, second access means for accessing data of the address book in response to requests from remote devices on a network, and control means for deciding to permit or deny address book data changing requests from the first access means, and from the second access means. The communication device also comprises first display control means for displaying a first guide display on the local user interface, wherein the first guide display is operable by a local user to access data of the address book from the first access means. In addition, the control means denies address book changes from the second access means while the first guide display is displayed on the local user interface and permits address book changes from the second access means when the first guide display is not displayed on the local user interface.

In a similar manner, independent Claims 11 and 23 are respectively directed to a method and a computer program.

Independent Claim 9 as amended is directed to a communication device having an address book storing data of communication destinations. The communication device comprises a local operating unit for accessing data of the address book for a local user via a local user interface, a remote operating unit for accessing data of the address book for remote users on a network, and a control unit for deciding to permit or deny address book data changing requests from the local operating unit, and from the remote operating unit. The communication device also comprises a first display control unit for displaying a first guide display on the local user interface, wherein the first guide display is operable by the local user to access data of the address book from the local operating unit.

In addition, the control unit denies address book changes from the remote operating unit while the first guide is displayed on the local user interface and permits address book changes from the remote operating unit when the first guide display is not displayed on the local user interface.

In a similar manner, independent Claims 19 and 24 as amended are respectively directed to a method and a computer program.

Newly-added independent Claim 31 is directed to a communication device having an address book storing data of communication destinations. The communication device comprises first access means for accessing data of the address book in response to operations of a local user interface, second access means for accessing data of the address book in response to requests from remote devices on a network, and control means for controlling to permit or prevent changing of the address book. In addition, the control means prevents changing of the address book by the second access means while a display regarding the address book is being displayed on an operating screen of the communication device, and permits changing of the address book by the second access means when the display regarding the address book is not being displayed on the operating screen of the communication device.

In a similar manner, newly-added independent Claim 32 is respectively directed to a method.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the invention of the subject application. In particular, the AAPA and the Johnson patent are not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature that address book changes are denied for a remote access while a first guide display, which is operable by a local user to access data of the address book, is displayed on a local user interface, and address book changes are permitted for the remote access when the first guide display is not displayed on the local user interface.

With reference to the AAPA, the Office Action alleged that the AAPA discloses use of a first guide display which is operable by a local user to access data of an address book, but recognized that the AAPA does not teach the permission or denial of data changing requests. However, the Office Action cited to Johnson for this alleged disclosure.

As understood by Applicants, Johnson discloses a protocol which allows processes in a distributed environment to access a file either through system calls, e.g. read and write, or through a mechanism that maps the file to their own address space such that the attributes of the files are efficiently and accurately distributed to all of the interested processes. In managing a file size attribute, clients that perform read or write system calls obtain permission to do so from the server of the file by requesting one of the file's multiple read tokens or the file's one write token. See Johnson, column 6, lines 11 to 25.

As such, since Johnson teaches that multiple read tokens are available for a file, a plurality of processes can read that file at the same time. Moreover, a process in possession of the write token in Johnson can write to the file, even if the file is being read by other processes.

In the present invention, however, changes to the address book are denied for a remote access while a first guide display, which is operable by a local user to access data of the address book, is displayed on a local user interface, and changes are permitted when the first guide display is not displayed. It is the access of the data of the address book, which may include a read operation, via the first guide display that serves as the basis for the denial or permission of address book changes by remote access. In contrast, Johnson permits a process to change a file even if the file is being read by other processes, provided that the process requesting to write is in possession of a write token.

As such, even if the AAPA and the Johnson patent are combined in the manner proposed in the Office Action (assuming for argument's sake that such combination would be permissible), the result would not teach at least the feature that

address book changes are denied for a remote access while a first guide display, which is operable by a local user to access data of the address book, is displayed on a local user interface, and that address book changes are permitted for the remote access when the first guide display is not displayed on the local user interface.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claims 1, 9, 11, 19, 23, 24, 31 and 32 are believed to be allowable over the applied references.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael K. O'Neill  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 94530v1